



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/401,868	09/23/1999	BARRY J. GILHULY	555255012109	5258

7590 01/21/2003

DAVID B COCHRAN ESQ
JONES DAY REAVIS & POGUE
NORTH POINT
901 LAKESIDE AVENUE
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

EDELMAN, BRADLEY E

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2153

DATE MAILED: 01/21/2003

26

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Q1

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/401,868	GILHULY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Bradley Edelman	2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 1999.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>4-25</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

This is a first Office Action on the merits of this case. Claims 1-54 are presented for examination. This application is a continuation-in-part of Application No. 09/087,623. Because claims 1-53 are directed towards the newly added subject matter, the effective filing date for the invention so claimed is the actual filing date, which is September 23, 1999.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

1. Claims 1-2, 5-6, 8, 15, 17-19, 34-35, 43, 49, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kuki (EP Pat. No. 772,327 A2).

In considering claim 1, Kuki discloses a method of redirecting data items from a messaging host system (e-mail server, not shown) to a user's mobile device (wireless communication terminal 100), comprising the steps of:

Detecting a new data item for the user at the messaging host system (inherent in an e-mail system, wherein the "messaging host system" is an e-mail server);

forwarding a copy of the new data item to a redirector host system (forwarding the e-mail to the host computer 200, col. 9, lines 10-26);

determining whether the new data item should be redirected from the redirector host system to the user's mobile device (col. 14, lines 25-35, wherein the system determines whether the message is of the type that should be forwarded); and

if the new data item should be redirected, then packaging the new data item into an electronic envelope and transmitting the electronic envelope to the user's mobile device (col. 14, lines 35-58, wherein the envelopes are inherent in a wireless messaging system).

In considering claim 2, Kuki further discloses storing the new data item in a user's inbox coupled to the messaging host system (this is inherent in the e-mail server, and also occurs in the host computer 200; col. 9, lines 22-25, before the message is forwarded).

In considering claim 5, in the system taught by Kuki, a copy of the new data item would inherently be copied at the e-mail server and stored at the user's inbox.

In considering claim 6, Kuki further discloses configuring a set of filtering rules at the redirector host system, and allowing a user to remotely configure and reconfigure the filtering rules to control redirection (col. 13, lines 5-10; col. 14, lines 35-58).

In considering claim 8, Kuki further discloses receiving the electronic envelope at the user's mobile device, extracting the new data item from the envelope, and storing the new data item within the memory of the mobile device (inherent in order to allow users to read messages).

In considering claim 15, Kuki further discloses transmitting a deactivation message from the user to the redirector host system, and upon receiving the deactivation message, prohibiting the redirection of data items for the user sending the deactivation message ("forwarding-end signal"; col. 9, line 53 – col. 10, line 8).

In considering claim 17, Kuki further disclose accessing a filter rules database including a list of filters to be applied to data items for a particular user, and applying the filters to the new data item to determine whether the new data item should be redirected to the user's mobile device (col. 14, lines 33-58, wherein the user sets particular filters for his/her device).

In considering claim 18, the system taught by Kuki inherently addresses the electronic envelope using the electronic address of the user's mobile device.

In considering claim 19, Kuki further discloses that the system is an e-mail system and the messages are e-mails (Abstract).

In considering claim 34, all of the limitations of claim 34 are disclosed by Kuki, and have already been discussed above.

In considering claim 35, Kuki further discloses the filter rules database and providing an interface to the filter rules database to allow the user to define and re-define the filter rules (col. 13, lines 5-10; col. 14, lines 33-58).

In considering claim 43, claim 43 contains no further limitations over claim 1, and is thus rejected for the same reasons as stated previously.

In considering claim 49, Kuki further discloses that the data items are e-mails and the messaging host is an e-mail server (Abstract).

In considering claim 51, Kuki further discloses the claimed filter system (col. 13, lines 5-10; col. 14, lines 33-58).

Art Unit: 2153

2. Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-24, 33-35, 38-39, 42-43, 47, and 49-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Eggleston et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,101,531, hereinafter "Eggleston").

In considering claim 1, Eggleston discloses a method of redirecting data items from a messaging host system (post office host server 240) to a user's mobile device (201), comprising the steps of:

Detecting a new data item for the user at the messaging host system (col. 7, lines 1-2, "the post office then checks for new mail received");
forwarding a copy of the new data item to a redirector host system (col. 7, line 2, "and forwards all such mail to the VSM", wherein the VSM resides on the communication server 220, col. 5, lines 49-51);

determining whether the new data item should be redirected from the redirector host system to the user's mobile device (col. 5, lines 49-52, "prestage filter"; col. 9, lines 12-16, "all unprocessed messages can be forwarded to the communications server, where the filters are applied via a prestage filter... with only qualified/filtered messages being forwarded to the client"); and

if the new data item should be redirected, then packaging the new data item into an electronic envelope and transmitting the electronic envelope to the user's mobile device (col. 9, lines 12-16, wherein packaging in an electronic envelope is inherent when the message is sent to the client).

In considering claim 2, Eggleston further discloses storing the new data item in a user's inbox coupled to the messaging host system (messages in a mail server are initially stored in an inbox; see col. 12, lines 47-49).

In considering claim 3, Eggleston further discloses determining whether a new data item has been received at the messaging host system for a particular user, and checking a forwarding file coupled to the messaging host system to determine whether the particular user's data items should be redirected to the redirector host system (col. 6, lines 8-22, wherein multiple users may have profiles; col. 8, line 64 – col. 9, line 10, wherein the mail server stores filtering and forwarding rules associated with the users).

In considering claim 5, Eggleston further discloses forwarding a copy of the new data item to the user's inbox on the messaging host system (col. 12, lines 44-50, wherein messages are initially stored at the mail server inbox).

In considering claim 6, Eggleston further discloses configuring a set of filtering rules at the redirector host system, and allowing a user to remotely configure and reconfigure the filtering rules to control redirection (col. 9, lines 51-62).

In considering claim 7, Eggleston further discloses:

configuring a user profile database for use by the redirector host system in determining whether the new data item should be redirected to the user's mobile data device ("active client profile", col. 5, lines 51-62); and

Providing an access mechanism that allows a system administrator of the messaging host system to remotely configure and reconfigure the user profile database (col. 14, lines 61-64; col. 15, lines 4-9, wherein an administrator controls the use limit of individual users).

In considering claim 8, Eggleston further discloses receiving the electronic envelope at the user's mobile device, extracting the new data item from the envelope, and storing the new data item within the memory of the mobile device (col. 7, lines 24-27; wherein extraction is inherent in order to allow users to read messages).

In considering claim 9, Eggleston further discloses preparing a reply at the mobile device that is related to the new data item ("reply", col. 11, lines 54-57), and packaging the reply data item into an electronic envelope and transmitting the electronic envelope to the redirector host system (col. 12, lines 15-16, wherein the reply sent via a wireless network is inherently packaged in an electronic envelope).

In considering claim 10, Eggleston further discloses that the electronic envelope is addressed using the electronic address of the redirector host system (col. 12, lines 15-16; inherent for the message to be sent to the redirector host system).

In considering claim 11, Eggleston further discloses extracting the reply data item from the electronic envelope at the redirector host system, reconfiguring the addressing information associated with the reply data item, and transmitting the reconfigured reply data item to the messaging host system (col. 12, line 62 – col. 13, line 3, wherein address reconfiguration is inherent for the message sent to the redirector host to be forwarded to the messaging host).

In considering claim 12, Eggleston further discloses receiving the reconfigured reply data item at the messaging host system, and storing the reply data item in a user's inbox coupled to the messaging host system (col. 12, line 62 – col. 13, line 3; col. 12, lines 26-28, wherein the "inbox" and "outbox" are both part of the mailbox, and thus perform the same function of storing messages).

In considering claim 14, Eggleston further discloses the steps of:

Providing the user's mobile device with an interface (202) to a wireless data network (col. 5, line 35);

Forwarding the electronic envelope from the redirector host system to a wireless gateway system ("BS"), and transmitting the electronic envelope from the wireless gateway system to the user's mobile device using the wireless data network (col. 7, lines 10-13; Fig. 1).

In considering claim 15, Eggleston further discloses transmitting a deactivation message from the user to the redirector host system, and upon receiving the deactivation message, prohibiting the redirection of data items for the user sending the deactivation message (col. 8, lines 50-63, wherein users may select which items to filter, or may select to filter no items or all items, according to the user's desires).

In considering claim 16, Eggleston further discloses the steps of accessing a user profile database including a list of authorized users; and checking whether the user associated with the new data item is an authorized user to determine whether the new data item should be redirected to the user's mobile device (col. 6, lines 40-46, 63-67).

In considering claim 17, Eggleston further disclose accessing a filter rules database including a list of filters to be applied to data items for a particular user, and applying the filters to the new data item to determine whether the new data item should be redirected to the user's mobile device (col. 6, lines 8-16; col. 8, lines 22-63).

In considering claim 18, Eggleston further discloses addressing the electronic envelope using the electronic address of the user's mobile device (col. 7, lines 10-12; inherent in the step of forwarding the item to the device).

In considering claim 19, Eggleston further discloses that the system is an e-mail system and the messages are e-mails (Abstract).

In considering claim 20, Eggleston further discloses that the mobile device is a laptop (Fig. 1).

In considering claim 21, Eggleston further discloses that the mobile device is a two-way paging computer (col. 4, lines 35-41, wherein “CDPD” “ARDIS” “GPRS” are all used for paging computers).

In considering claim 22, Eggleston further discloses that the two-way paging computer includes a wireless network interface (202) for communicating with the redirector host system via a wireless data network (col. 5, line 35).

In considering claim 23, Eggleston further discloses that the redirector host system is coupled to the wireless data network via a wireless gateway system (“BS”; col. 7, lines 10-12).

In considering claim 24, Eggleston further discloses that the electronic envelope is addressed using the wireless data network address of the two-way paging computer (inherent for the message to be sent to the wireless computer).

In considering claim 33, Eggleston further discloses compressing (truncating) the data item and placing the compressed data item into the envelope before sending it to the mobile device (col. 10, lines 10-17).

In considering claim 34, all of the limitations of claim 34 are disclosed by Eggleston, and have already been discussed above.

In considering claim 35, Eggleston further discloses the filter rules database and providing an interface to the filter rules database to allow the user to define and re-define the filter rules (col. 9, lines 27-65).

In considering claim 38, Eggleston further discloses accessing a user profile database coupled to the wireless redirector host system to verify that the user associated with the e-mail message is an authorized user (col. 6, lines 40-46).

In considering claim 39, Eggleston further discloses providing an access mechanism that allows a system administrator of the messaging host system to remotely configure and reconfigure the user profile database (col. 14, lines 60-63; col. 15, lines 1-8).

In considering claims 42 and 50, Eggleston further discloses that the wireless redirector host system and the wireless mobile device communicate through a wireless gateway system and a wireless communication network (col. 7, lines 6-12; Fig. 1).

In considering claim 43, claim 43 contains no further limitations over claim 1, and is thus rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

In considering claim 47, Eggleston further discloses the claimed redirector software program, filter rules database, and user profile database (col. 8, lines 22-63; col. 6, lines 40-46).

In considering claim 49, Eggleston further discloses that the data items are e-mails and the messaging host is an e-mail server (Abstract).

In considering claim 51, Eggleston further discloses the claimed filter system (col. 8, lines 22-65).

3. Claim 54 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Woltz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,995,597, hereinafter "Woltz").

In considering claim 54, Woltz discloses a method of operating a host system configured to redirect e-mail messages from the Internet to a user's wireless mobile device, comprising the steps of:

Receiving an e-mail message from the Internet for a particular user (col. 3, lines 23-24);

Accessing a user profile database to determine whether the particular user is an authorized user of the host system (col. 3, lines 59-65);

If the user is an authorized user, then accessing a filter rules database to apply a set of user-defined filtering rules to the e-mail message that dictate whether the e-mail message is the type of message that the user wants to have redirected to its wireless mobile device (col. 4, lines 20-24); and

If the e-mail message clears the filtering rules, then repackaging the e-mail message into an electronic envelope including the address of the user's wireless mobile device and forwarding the electronic envelope to a wireless gateway system for transmission onto a wireless data network associated with the user's mobile device (col. 4, lines 26-35, wherein the repackaging and the gateway are necessary, and thus inherent, for the messages to be sent from a wired network to a wireless network).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2153

4. Claims 20-22, 25-26, 28, 40-41, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuki, in view of what was well known in the art at the time the invention was made.

In considering claims 20 and 21, Kuki fails to explicitly disclose that the user's mobile device is a laptop computer or two-way paging computer. Nonetheless, Examiner takes official notice that the use of both laptop computers and two-way pagers for wireless message forwarding of e-mail are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use either of those devices to receive the redirected messages in order to allow millions of laptop and pager owners to use the system.

In considering claim 22, Kuki further discloses that the mobile device includes a wireless network interface (inherent) for communicating with the redirector host system via a wireless data network (300, Fig. 2).

In considering claims 25 and 40, Kuki does not disclose that the host system is an Internet Service Provider. Nonetheless, Examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known in the art for ISPs to offer e-mail services to e-mail users, and thus to act as messaging host computers. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to have an ISP run the messaging host taught by Kuki, to provide wider access to the message forwarding system.

In considering claim 26, Kuki further discloses that the data items are e-mail (Abstract), and thus inherently discloses a mail server program.

In considering claim 28, 41, and 44, Kuki further discloses that the messaging host system and the redirector host system are coupled via a Wide Area Network (col. 9, lines 19-21). Although Kuki does not mention the Internet, Examiner takes Official Notice that the Internet is a notoriously well known, if not the most well known, wide area network, and thus it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use the system taught by Kuki over the Internet, in order to provide world-wide access.

5. Claims 25-28, 40-41, 44, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggleston.

In considering claims 25, 26, 28, 40, 41, and 44, these claims are rejected under the same rationale as discussed above regarding the Kuki reference.

In considering claim 27, Eggleston further discloses that the messaging host includes a forwarding database coupled to the mail server program for detecting whether a new data item received at the mail server should be forwarded to a redirector host system (col. 9, lines 1-16, wherein the message filters determine whether the messages should be forwarded), and for determining the electronic address of that redirector host system (inherent in forwarding messages to the redirector host system).

In considering claim 48, Eggleston discloses filtering the messages at the redirector host, but does not explicitly disclose storing the messages at the redirector host. Nonetheless, Eggleston does disclose storing certain messages at the messaging host, which forwards messages the same way as the redirector host. Thus, storing messages at a forwarding system is well known. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of including a storage system at the redirector host, to prevent undesired deletion of messages that may have been incorrectly filtered but were never stored at the messaging host. Therefore, it would have been obvious to include a data store for storing messages at the redirector host taught by Eggleston.

6. Claims 4, 45, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggleston, in view of Woltz.

In considering claim 4, although the system taught by Eggleston teaches substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose that the forwarding file includes a list of system addresses where the user's data items should be forwarded by the messaging host system. Nonetheless, including a list of system addresses for forwarding messages to a wireless device is well known, as evidenced by Woltz. In a similar art, Woltz discloses a system for forwarding messages from a messaging host to users' wireless devices, wherein the host maintains a list of different addresses to which to forward received messages (col. 4, lines 26-50). Thus, given the teaching of Woltz, a

person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of including the address list taught by Woltz in the forwarding file taught by Eggleston, so that users can receive their messages at different devices depending on their location. Therefore, it would have been obvious to use the forwarding address list taught by Woltz in the system taught by Eggleston.

In considering claim 45, Eggleston further discloses a sendmail program at the messaging host for receiving and transmitting user data items (col. 7, lines 1-2). However, Eggleston fails to disclose a forwarding file containing a list of authorized users of the system and the predetermined address to which the messaging host system will forward each user data item. Nonetheless, such an authorization and addressing system is well known and is further disclosed by Woltz (col. 3, lines 59-67; col. 4, lines 1-12). Thus, given the teaching of Woltz, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of including the authorization and addressing features taught by Woltz in the messaging host taught by Eggleston, so that messages could be sent automatically to one of a users' multiple mobile devices, thereby allowing the user to retrieve messages from many locations. Therefore, it would have been obvious to include the authorization and addressing features taught by Woltz in the system taught by Eggleston.

In considering claim 46, Eggleston further discloses the messaging host including a local data store ("inbox") for storing the data items of users having accounts on the messaging host system (col. 12, lines 25-30).

7. Claims 29-30, 36-37, and 52-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggleston, in view of Birrell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,158,551, hereinafter "Birrell").

In considering claims 29, 30, 36, 37, 52, and 53, all of these claims describe the feature of using a web page to alter the filtering rules and the user profile. Although the use of such a web-based system is not discussed in the Eggleston patent, the use of web-based e-mail, and particularly allowing control over a user's profile and filtering rules via a web-based interface is well known, as evidenced by Birrell. See col. 11, "Filtering Messages," col. 6, lines 4-10. Birrell further discloses that client computers may be mobile computers (col. 2, lines 39-47). Thus, given the teaching of Birrell, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of incorporating web-based e-mail, as taught by Birrell, in the system taught by Eggleston, so that users could control their forwarding setting from anywhere in the world. Therefore, it would have been obvious to incorporate web-based e-mail in the system taught by Eggleston.

8. Claims 13, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggleston, in view of Adler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,630, hereinafter "Adler").

In considering claim 13, Eggleston further discloses extracting the reply item from the electronic envelope at the redirector host system, and reconfiguring the addressing information associated with the reply data item, and transmitting the reply to the destination system (col. 12, line 66 – col. 13, line 1; inherent when the redirector host relays the messages to the messaging host). However, Eggleston does not disclose that the reply messages are then transmitted to the destination system using an electronic address included in the reply data item. Nonetheless, such a system is well known, as evidenced by Adler. In a similar art, Adler discloses a system for forwarding messages from a host server to a wireless device, and for sending replies back to the original sender from the wireless device (Fig. 5), wherein the replies are sent through the host server (col. 3, lines 54-59; col. 4, lines 11-14, wherein messages sent from the wireless device are sent to the server in the same way as messages sent from the terminal 431) and wherein such messages include the sender e-mail address both before and after passing through the server (both will include the sender e-mail address). Given the teaching of Adler, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of sending replies in the manner taught by Adler by the system taught by Eggleston, in order to give users access to the same e-mail system from both a LAN and a wireless device, thereby consolidating the number of e-mail addresses one must monitor. Therefore, it would

have been obvious to use the addressing scheme taught by Adler in the system taught by Eggleston.

In considering claim 31, Eggleston further discloses configuring a user profile database for use by the redirector host system in determining whether the new data item should be redirected to the user's mobile data device (col. 5, lines 49-62; col. 8, lines 22-60). However, Eggleston does not disclose storing the electronic address of the user's mobile device in the profile database. Nonetheless, storing a mobile device in a user profile database is well known, as evidenced by Adler. The Adler system further stores the mobile device electronic address in a profile database (col. 4, lines 11-25). Thus, given the teaching of Adler, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of including the electronic address of the user's mobile device in the profile database taught by Eggleston, so that it could be easily accessed whenever messages were sent to or from the mobile device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to store the address taught by Eggleston in a user profile database, as taught by Adler.

In considering claim 32, Adler further discloses storing information regarding type and configuration of the mobile device in the profile database (col. 4, lines 19-25).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley Edelman whose telephone number is (703) 306-3041. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

For all After Final papers: (703) 746-7238.

For all other correspondences: (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

BE
January 10, 2003



GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100